

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The rejection presented in the Office Action dated July 27, 2009 (hereinafter Office Action), has been considered, and reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

Without acquiescing to characterizations of the asserted art, Applicant's claimed subject matter, or to the applications of the asserted art or combinations thereof to Applicant's claimed subject matter, each of the independent claims has been amended to characterize that one or more identifiers included in one or more entered calendar notes is detected and the one or more calendar notes are associated with one or more calendar profiles on the basis of the detection. Support for these changes may be found in the original specification, for example, at paragraphs [0020], [0022], [0026], and [0032]; therefore, the changes do not introduce new matter. The pending claims are believed to be patentable over the asserted reference for the reasons set forth below.

The asserted reference does not teach or suggest “*detecting one or more identifiers included in one or more calendar notes entered, each identifier being related to one or more calendar profiles*” or “*associating the one or more calendar notes with the one or more calendar profiles in a terminal on the basis of the detected one or more identifiers, each calendar profile defining a unique view to calendar content on the basis of the calendar notes associated with the calendar profile*”. Mansikkaniemi does not mention identifiers included in calendar notes and instead describes a conventional procedure of inputting certain new calendar events to certain calendars (individual or family). The claimed calendar profiles operate similar to different user profiles (*see, e.g.* paragraphs [0017] and [0024]) such that a calendar of Mansikkaniemi (*e.g.* shared family calendar) does not correspond to the claimed profile. Mansikkaniemi teaches that certain new events can be designated to be shown on the family calendar or on an individual's calendar but does not teach that a single calendar note will provide a unique (*i.e.* different) view to the calendar content when a selected calendar profile changes and when the calendar note has been associated with a specific calendar profile on the basis of one or more identifiers included in the calendar note.

Mansikkaniemi also does not disclose the claim limitations directed to “*selecting in the terminal at least one calendar profile for generating calendar content to be shared*” because simply selecting between a family calendar and an individual’s calendar does not correspond to selecting a calendar profile as claimed. A calendar profile of the claimed invention does not correspond to a calendar of Mansikkaniemi since the claimed calendar profiles operate similar to different user profiles (*see, e.g.* paragraphs [0017] and [0024] of the present application). Similarly, Mansikkaniemi also fails to teach “*generating the calendar content to be shared on the basis of at least one selected calendar profile and the one or more calendar notes associated with it by the terminal*”. In Mansikkaniemi, the generation of the calendar content is not made on the basis of calendar profiles and the notes associated therewith based on detected identifiers. Instead, each calendar event is generated and added to a calendar by a user in Mansikkaniemi.

The claimed solution differs from Mansikkaniemi in that once a calendar note is entered, it is associated to one or more calendar profiles based on one or more identifiers included in the calendar note. Then, a calendar content is generated (and shared) on the basis of a selected calendar profile and the one or more calendar notes that are associated with this specific profile. Thus, it is possible to enter each calendar note only once, for example, to one’s personal calendar, but numerous different calendar content can be generated on the basis of the profiles with which each calendar note is associated. Without a presentation of correspondence to each of the claimed limitations, the § 102(b) rejection would be improper, and Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 4, 8, 9, and 13 depend from independent claims 1, 5, and 10, respectively, and also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Mansikkaniemi. While Applicant does not acquiesce with the particular rejections to these dependent claims, these rejections are also improper for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent claims 1, 5, and 10. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims and recite additional features which further distinguish these claims from the cited reference.

Therefore, the rejection of dependent claims 4, 8, 9, and 13 is improper, and Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (KOL.217.WUS) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the undersigned attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC  
8500 Normandale Lake Blvd., Suite 320  
Minneapolis, MN 55437  
952.854.2700

Date: September 29, 2009

By: /Erin M. Nichols/

Erin M. Nichols  
Reg. No. 57,125